

Summary

Claims 1-4 were pending. Claim 1 has been rewritten. No new matter has been added as a result of this amendment.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-4 were allowed excepting the Examiner indicated that correction of several formal matters in Claim 1 was required. Although Applicant is appreciative that the Examiner allowed all of the claims, Applicant traverses the objections.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a passive keyless entry device that comprises a car mounting device. The car mounting device comprises a low frequency signal transmitting section, a receiving section for a keyless entry for receiving an answer signal of a high frequency responsive to the request signal from the keyless entry portable device, a receiving section for monitoring the tire pneumatic pressure for receiving the answer signal of the high frequency responsive to the request signal from the transmitter-receiver for monitoring the tire pneumatic pressure, and a controller.

The Examiner required that “a receiving section for a keyless entry for receiving...” be changed to “a receiving section for the keyless entry device for receiving...” However, page 12, lines 1-2, for example, describes a receiving section for a keyless entry... This receiving section is labeled as element 4 in Fig. 1. Changing the language would at best result in confusion as it is clear that elements in the car mounting device, rather than elements in the keyless entry portable device, are being described in this portion of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant traverses the objection.

In addition, the Examiner required that “a receiving section for monitoring...” in Claim 1 be changed to “the receiving section for monitoring...” However, page 12, lines 6-7, for example, describes a receiving section for monitoring... This receiving section is labeled as element 6 in Fig. 1. Accordingly, as the functionality of receiving section 6 is

different from that of receiving section 4 (even if they are implemented within the same physical element), the use of "a" rather than "the" is appropriate. Thus, Applicant traverses the objection.

Further, the Examiner required that "within the car mounting device" in Claim 1 be added after "a controller" to indicate that controller is within the car mounting device. Applicant submits that this is duplicative as the entire paragraph is directed towards elements of the car mounting device. Accordingly, Applicant traverses the objection.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that a telephone interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Anthony P. Curtis, Ph.D.
Registration No. 46,193
Agent for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200